



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 09/848,778 | 05/03/2001 | Peter A. BeereI | 06666-077001/USC3027 | 6633 |
| 20985 | 7590 | 08/18/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081 | | | TORRES, JOSEPH D | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2133 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/848,778

Applicant(s)

BEEREL ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph D. Torres

Art Unit

2133

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph D. Torres.

(3) John Phillips.

(2) Keith Chugg.

(4) Joseph Juliano and Georgeois Dimou.

Date of Interview: 08 August 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Viterbi.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed possible amendment to the specification defining parallel suffix and prefix operations.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

JOSEPH TORRES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California
92130

Telephone
858 678-5070

Facsimile
858 678-5099

Web Site
www.fr.com

Date July 27, 2005

To Joseph D. Torres
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Patent)
Telephone:

Facsimile number 06666-07700001 / (571) 273-3829

From Joseph Juliano

Re REDUCED-LATENCY SOFT-IN/SOFT-OUT MODULE
Applicant: Beerel, et al.
Application No.: 09/848,778
Filing Date: May 3, 2001
Our Ref.: 06666-077001

Number of pages
including this page 3

Message

NOTE: This facsimile is intended for the addressee only and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately call us collect at 858 678-5070 to arrange for its return. Thank you.

PTOL-413A (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031
US P US D P R N F R

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/848,778 First Named Applicant: Peter A. Beere1
Examiner: Joseph D. Torres Art Unit: 2133 Status of Application: pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Keith Chugg (2) John Phillips
(3) Georgeois Dimou (4) Joseph Juliano

Proposed Date of Interview: August 8, 2005 Proposed Time: 2 (AM/PM) ET
11 AM Pacific Time

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

| Issues (Rej., Obj., etc) | Claims/ Fig. #s | Prior Art | Discussed | Agreed | Not Agreed |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) <u>112 Rej.'s (see attached)</u> | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (2) <u>102 Rej.'s (see attached)</u> | | <u>Viterbi</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (3) <u>103 Rej.'s (see attached)</u> | | <u>Viterbi</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (4) _____ | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Joseph Juliano

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

54,780

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Attachment for Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/848,778

Art Unit: 2133

Attorney's Docket No.: 06666-077001

Rejections to be Discussed (cont'd)

(1) 112 Rej.'s:

Claims 1-19, 36-90, 92, 94, 96, 98, 100 and 102.

(2) 102 Rej.'s:

Claims 1-2, 6-12, 15-17, 19, 36-38, 42-47, 50-52, 59, 61-63, 67-71, 74-76, 85-90, 93, 94, 97, 98, 101 and 102.

(3) 103 Rej.'s:

Claims 1-15, 17-19 and 36-102.

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Regarding the objection to the specification and the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, Applicant would like a confirmation that the suggested amendment to the specification, "suffix operation ~~can be~~ is defined" would remove this objection and these rejections. Regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103, Applicant continues to disagree with examiner's interpretation of trellis and believed that the interpretation of trellis, as used in the current office action, is not viable as a result of amendments made in response to the first response to an office action, as preliminarily discussed in an interview on Tuesday March 30, 2004. Applicant would like to understand why the examiner has returned to this interpretation, why the current claims are rejected over Viterbi. and any potential solutions to this issue.